

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-2342

MELESSE HUNDE,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A78-155-154)

Submitted: June 18, 2004

Decided: August 9, 2004

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David A. Garfield, LAW OFFICES OF DAVID GARFIELD, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Richard M. Evans, Assistant Director, Carl H. McIntyre, Jr., Senior Litigation Counsel, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Melesse Hunde, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") affirming, without opinion, the immigration judge's order denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

In his petition for review, Hunde raises challenges to the immigration judge's determination that he failed to establish his eligibility for asylum. To obtain reversal of a determination denying eligibility for relief, an alien "must show that the evidence he presented was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution." INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 483-84 (1992). We have reviewed the evidence of record and conclude that Hunde fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that he seeks.

Additionally, we uphold the immigration judge's denial of Hunde's request for withholding of removal. The standard for withholding of removal is more stringent than that for granting asylum. Chen v. INS, 195 F.3d 198, 205 (4th Cir. 1999). To qualify for withholding of removal, an applicant must demonstrate "a clear probability of persecution." INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 430 (1987). Because Hunde fails to show that he is

eligible for asylum, he cannot meet the higher standard for withholding of removal.

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED